



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/223,472	12/30/1998	KEVIN J. LEE	042390.P6604	1561

7590 10/07/2002

MICHAEL A BERNADICOU  
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 900251026

EXAMINER	
LEADER, WILLIAM T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1741	

DATE MAILED: 10/07/2002

19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Interview Summary

Application No.  
09/223,472

Applicant(s)  
Lee

Examiner  
William Leader

Art Unit  
1741



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) William Leader

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Stephen DeKlerk

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Oct 3, 2002

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 25, 26, 32, and 33

Identification of prior art discussed:

Norris (4,151,062)

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. DeKlerk requested an interview to discuss the final rejection of the claims. Mr. DeKlerk expressed the view that the Norris patent did not teach the limitations of claim 1. Exr. Leader commented that all elements of claim 1 were considered to be met by Norris as explained in the final rejection. In particular, the figures of Norris were considered to show an outlet for directing liquid toward the surface of a substrate, which was off-center from a central axis of the substrate and was at an angle other than normal to the surface of the substrate when viewed from directions consistent with the wording of claim 1. Norris teaches that his arrangement of nozzles causes movement of the solution in a circular pattern. Mr. DeKlerk inquired about amending the claims, but Exr. Leader pointed out that such an amendment would present claims of a scope not previously considered, and would probably not be entered. Exr. Leader pointed out that claims 25, 26, 32 and 33 contained allowable subject matter and only stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

W Leader  
Examiner's signature, if required